

GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

6:15p.m.
Wednesday, July 7, 2004

Public Services Building
Conference Rooms 2 & 3

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTION/ MINUTES

GMOC MEMBERS PRESENT: Arroyo Krogh
Munoz Nordstrom
O'Neill Palma
Spethman Tripp

MEMBERS ABSENT: Garcia

STAFF PRESENT: Mayor Steve Padilla
Dave Rowlands, City Manager
George Krempf, Asst. City Manager
Tom Oriola, Mayor/Council Chief of Staff
Jim Sandoval, Planning & Building Director
Dan Forster, Growth Management Coordinator
Cherryl Cisneros, Management Assistant
Danny Serrano, Intern

GUESTS: Cheryl Cox, CVESD
Kimberly Longo, Public
Mya Bloch, Public

1. CALL TO ORDER

Roll call was taken and GMOC Chairman Tripp called the meeting to order at 6:25p.m. The commission unanimously motioned to excuse Commissioner Garcia absence.

2. DISCUSSION OF SCHOOLS ELEMENT OF THE GMOC REPORT WITH CITY MANAGER DAVID D. ROWLANDS, JR.

COMMISSIONER TRIPP: "Agenda Item No. 2, Discussion of schools element of the GMOC report with City Manager David D. Rowlands, Jr. Well I noticed that we have our City Manager here, Mayor Padilla, welcome."

TOM ORIOLA: "Hi I'm Tom Oriola, Mayor's Chief of Staff".

COMMISSIONER TRIPP: "During this past years deliberations, the majority of the GMOC, in fact the GMOC came to a consensus, that we felt that it was through thinking outside the box, within our purview, however you want to couch it. I will read from a section of the Municipal Code that I read at a public hearing, public meeting, that seemed to help bolster the direction that we took. It's in section 19.09.02.0 of our Municipal Code Section B finding. Way back when the

City council man adopted the Growth Management Program:

“City council to coexist hereby finds, No. 1 –the demand for facilities and improvement has outpaced the supply resulting in shortages in public facilities and improvements including but not limiting to streets, schools, libraries and general governmental facilities. These shortages are detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Chula Vista.”

“And while recognizing that the sky is not falling within our community because our elected officials and our city management teams do their jobs quite well. Understanding that, the GMOC looked at the word “accommodate” in the schools threshold. And in thinking outside the box, we felt it was within our purview to consider some subjective criteria that had not been considered in the years historically, since 1987. So we—with that in mind, that’s the path we went down. And I realize that there are commissioners on this commission that feel that we’re independent—and we are independent bodies. But understanding that word, I would just ask that we move forward judicially when we deal with that word, understanding that we work with several jurisdictions, elected bodies, appointed bodies and we’re part of –I think the word team is starting to get over used—but we’re part of a process that we need to be careful how we make our point.

So—at the public hearing with Planning Commission and City Council, with as much work as we’ve done, as I was a little bit surprised that anyone was surprised of the direction we were going. And I felt that it was the best decision at the time to kind of take a time out and pull back from the way this thing appeared to of been going. And in making that determination, I had the council of several people, Mayor Padilla, our City Manager, some representatives of the school district and other council members. I want to make it clear that in this discussion it was my decision and my offer to say time out. It needed more dialogue, we needed to digest this thing and make sure that the people that mattered understood the direction.

So again, it was my decision and I appreciate your support as well as the support of our—the folks that were involved. So having said that, we are gathered here today, City Manager Rowlands, Mayor Padilla, Tom Oriola welcome.”

CITY MANAGER ROWLANDS: “We thought tonight -- our mission is to talk about the future, what’s next in this process with schools and explain from our prospective and explain what may have been tweaked typically. First thing the quality and conclusion to the report, across the board, were excellent. The only glitch from the entire document was the recommendation of non-compliance that was it. Other parts of your recommendations were totally acceptable to the school district.”

COMMISSIONER SPETHMAN: “ I’m sorry Mr. Rowlands, we’re having a hard time hearing you.”

CITY MANAGER ROWLANDS: “The school district indicated that the report that’s submitted was totally appropriate and totally correct except for the issue of non-compliance. The narrative, the actual facts being recommended to council via the schools, no problem. The issue is the non-compliance part. They’re coming into the GMOC in August with their master plan. That document should be reviewed by you folks very thoroughly and used as a vehicle to reopen dialogue with the schools on your issues. The master plan, they believe would lay out for you all the things you wanted to talk about concerning what makes the school appropriate, what’s the appropriate level of restrooms per child, etc. That will be coming to you folks in August for your analysis and review. So this is not a dead issue yet. The issue before the council meeting was a matter of fairness and Steve will walk you through this—that small glitch.”

MAYOR PADILLA: “I think that um—First all for the council as a whole always expects from all the boards and commissions that binds us and provide us with input--prospective on various issues and exercise independent judgment or independent interpretation of what it is your seeing and always say what it is your see, that’s not the issue. Many of you know, a couple things have disturbed me, and looking at some of the emails that have gone back and forth and some of the dialogue from members of the commission, a suggestion of politics and backroom deals and other silly things like that. Most of you know from my public career and certainly my campaign when I sought for office and my own personal politics these are the issues with the SUHSD that I am not a huge fan of the district, and I have been very publicly critical of the district and I think—as the Mayor of the city and I will continue to be so when I think its appropriate for the community to be concerned about issues that are impacted by what the district is doing or is not doing and that’s a separate issue. So I’m sort of a little-have my skivvies in a little bit in a knot at the suggestion that something sorted or unusual was going on here because that is not the case.

But when I had a conversation before the GMOC joint meeting with the chairman here, I did get confirmation that this body and looking and exercising your appropriate role, applied some new definitions to accommodate and to some other things within the framework of the GMOC standards—that frankly has not been used before, not that their incorrect, not that they shouldn’t be used. But that they just had not been applied in that manner or interpreted in that manner before and in addition to that—that had occurred in point in the process where the SUHSD and their staff had not had the opportunity to comment on that, to digest that, to provide feed back or whatever it is before the final recommendation was made. And that was their assertion and that was what was confirmed to us prior to the meeting by the chairman. And so given that information, I think our first concern was, the fairness issue. Now, the problem is if the GMOC as a commission believes and as you know the council was already

reworking through the entire Growth Management Oversight ordinance, we've had some pretty interesting debates about that if you have been watching in the press lately about how we should change that ordinance, what we should do, what we should not do. And we're taking a top to bottom review of all of the threshold standards and what should be measured and what shouldn't be measured and how it should be measured, to include schools. And given that we're in that process if the GMOC as a commission believes that the definition should be applied differently or interpreted differently or more broadly if there should be things that we should be considering that we are not which seems to be part of what you are suggesting in the report which I happen to agree with. Then the proper process for that to take place really is for the GMOC to say here are the current standards and here are the current definitions and under the current program here's the result. However, we recommend to you city council that you change or as your changing your GMOC framework and ordinance that you broaden the definition as we have or that you change them or that you apply new standards or that you measured things that you are not measuring but you should be. And that's fine but the problem I think or at least the perceived problem was that there was a shift in that –that occurred at least in the view of the district that they didn't have adequate time to address or to respond to that led to a finding that they were out of compliance without that process having taken place.

And look I am not—I am the last person who is going to be afraid to criticize the SUHSD okay—um but when the messenger's creditability is called into question because their being accused of not being fair then what they have to say does not get heard. Because everyone is talking about how unfair the process was rightly or wrongly and they're not listening to the message. And I think the bottom line for you folks and for the council is if we got something important to say about compliance by schools and providing impacts of growth in the districts primary and secondary, we want that message to be heard by the council and by the community and we want to be able to change the rules if that's what we need to do. We want to be able to have a set of standards that makes sense that everyone understands up front, we want to be able to use that as a tool to solve the problem.

So you know—on a personal level I would have been very happy to hear whatever it was the criticisms were publicly at that meeting. I think the judgment was made that it probably wouldn't be fair and it wouldn't probably be productive and that was why that decision was ultimately made by your chairman and I think it was concluded by myself and Council member Rindone, some other members of the council. All of those issues need to be on the table, so what does that mean from our prospective I think as a council? And that is okay so Sweetwater came in and screamed real loud and said we didn't have an opportunity and whatever; I can't make an independent judgment on that, I wasn't in all your meetings, I wasn't there and neither was the council but under the circumstances the right thing to probably do is to say okay now you know what they are; you

know what the report says now you will have an opportunity to address those—what the GMOC has done; you will have an opportunity to more formally respond to them if that's what you choose to do. I think at the end of the day its not going to stop whatever recommendations you want to make from coming forward including recommendations to change our standards if that's what you think we should do. Its' not going to change your conclusions if that's what you choose however you choose as a body to draw your conclusions. So it's not going to make the issue go away, no one's brushing anything under the table or under the carpet or anything of the sort. It was simply a matter of, is everybody on the same page, do we understand what measurements we're imploring and why. And has everyone had an opportunity as an organization, individual to respond to that. And if everyone is satisfied I think we are looking at a timeframe of August to come back with this piece of the overall report and take a look at it. “

CITY MANAGER ROWLANDS: “This factor is conducive -- before earlier on last month--This process has actual more spotlight based upon the schools issues than being part of the overall report of all the other GMOC issues. So when you come back to council in August it will only be on this one question not the entire millions of issues; therefore the Sweetwater has to be very cautious in my opinion, about how they handle this next phase of this dialogue because they know it will go back publicly this time with full disclosure of their master plan, with your involvement as a commission to advise city council on that master plan.”

MAYOR PADILLA: “I think an unattended by product of separating it out and delaying this piece a little bit may actually be that there will be more public attention paid and more spotlight paid to the issue of schools and the GMOC report than there otherwise would have been probably even if you would of moved forward. So probably as an unattended consequence that's probably a good thing at the end of the day.”

COMMISSIONER MUNOZ: “I think you said pretty much what I think we as a group believe just a little bit differently. I think the part about being unfair is an arbitrary term okay. But the whole GMOC process and the criteria we have is arbitrary so when somebody cries unfair and it's arbitrary who to say what's really unfair or not. I think the part that, we as a group looked at and evaluated at we have the right within the purview of all the jurisdictional requirements within the City of Chula Vista. We made the judgment call, arbitrary has no limits and we felt we were within that situation. Maybe Sweetwater cried foul because it didn't go the way they wanted to and that's why it's unfair; but is it really unfair, its arbitrary yeah maybe they need more time, maybe they need more discussion.”

COMMISSIONER TRIPP: “I think the point Ralph, was that the appearance that it was applied inconsistently and personally I think it's valid.”

COMMISSIONER KROGH: “ I think the first time you ever were to raise something up its going to seem like its unfair but I'm not sure if the impression

you got from my understanding of -- they were aware before there was a draft before we had the public workshop; they had someone at the public workshop; Ed Brand even wrote an editorial that got in the newspaper and was printed the morning of the -- they knew and yes we were being avant-garde or risqué or whatever to put out a new -- in response to their feedback at the public workshop last night I went through I looked at the draft before that workshop and found and Dan did a good job of taking our consensus and changing the wording and their was a few words that might have seemed more loaded and took those out and toned down some other stuff we took out this flat non-compliance and we said "yes we recommend that technically their in compliance" but tried to do as much as could to continue to express the concern and back off the -- hard line degree of it and it just seemed like they were aware of it and they did have a chance to respond and we just had a different -- to clean up."

MAYOR PADILLA: "I actually agree with you on a personal level, and Ralph as well. I think that there's a lot of reasons why they could be asserting the position that they are and I don't think its appropriate as a city, as an organization to necessarily take the opportunity to take issue with what those potential reasons are. Just from a purely diplomatic, and I know everyone loves that word, point of view, but there is such a thing as diplomacy and decorum and taking the higher road sometimes when maybe your gut instinct is to do otherwise. I have no idea to what degree that the staff level or the policy level they knew or who knew what when or how much. But I do know that you have them asserting very a firmly that they felt they needed an opportunity to respond to something that had changed and that was acknowledged by the chairman and other members at the time.

So given that, I think the right thing to do is to say okay, fine, take some more time take a look at what the GMOC is talking about, recommending and get back to us more formally and then we'll be glad to have this discussion in a few weeks. And really I think at the end of the day what we want in the community I think is a discussion about the merits of the issue not a distracted side bar discussion about the process or about fairness. Whether we agreed that it was fair or unfair is immaterial; whether the commission agrees or everyone agrees because at the end of the day, what you want to be talking about are the issues you brought forward. How do we measure the impact on schools? How do we talk about the schools issues in a constructive way? How do we find solutions? How do we have an honest assessment of that? And that's what's important and that's the discussion we want. We want to have this discussion as a community; we do not want this discussion to be about who got one over on who; by not giving them an opportunity to respond -- that's a distraction let's have the discussion. So they scream real loud and we give them extra time to respond; we're being fair, we're being more than fair. Lets have the discussion and that's kind, I think, of where we were coming from at the time that night."

COMMISSIONER SPETHMAN: "Steve, I've been on this commission for four years, there's two people on this body that were here previous to me. I came in

as a novice and I looked at the schools situation and saw a red flag four years ago. We've had nothing but open dialogue with the Sweetwater High School District. I have not been shy about my concerns regarding the school district. I have asked Katy Wright, we have spent hours on school district, over and above everything else. We don't unanimously – we did not unanimously agree on every issue regarding the schools and for four years the Sweetwater High School District has been a hot topic. The Sweetwater High School District was always invited and included in every single one of our discussions and open meetings. Ed Brand, we gave him an open calendar, finally, Ed Brand has shunned us, he has ignored us, I applaud Katy Wright and Bruce Husson for being the front people for the Sweetwater High School District; believe me they've taken a lot of heat. That having been said, Ed Brand came, I thought we had an amicable meeting, I thought we had open dialogue situation that was coming up and then I show up to this meeting and I got to tell you I felt like I was publicly castrated at the eleventh hour the Sweetwater High School District went behind closed doors with the Mayor, City Manager and a representative of the City Council who was also a high school principal. It didn't look good, Steve."

COMMISSIONER TRIPP: "I invited them into the room."

COMMISSIONER SPETHMAN: "I'm not making any accusations. I'm not making any accusations. We were put on hold. We voted unanimously. Katy Wright knew at a public workshop, in front of the community what our decision was; she took a public stance in front of the community to denounce our decision. Sweetwater High School District was not in the dark about our decision, they were fully aware of what our conclusion was."

MAYOR PADILLA: "And certainly, if we gave you that impression, in terms of being unappreciative of your work, we certainly didn't intend -- "

COMMISSIONER SPETHMAN: "I did not, I did not by my comment regard when I said a public castration. I did not mean that you guys were unappreciative of what we're doing. You put us in an extremely awkward position. We got up, went out the door, came back in, got up, went out the door -- three times."

CITY MANAGER: "What happened that night it was very, very uncomfortable. Also it was kind of messy from the point of view of having the major points you were raising lost in the entire debate of verbiage about unfairness, etc. etc. etc. You would have council members asking some very hard questions, you had myself asking some very hard questions. I knew from staff discussions there was issue on this. It's my responsibility, not the staff; I should have been here myself – as manager. Part of it might have been you're on the right track gentlemen, ladies but this man is the one who's to make that call; bring it back to the council for dialogue by council. But the framework of the rules indicates to the council paints the framework of what you folks do. If I would have been in the room, I would of gone in that direction. It's my error. When it came down to the written

document, then I saw the written document that night at that meeting – it would of embarrassed you and would've embarrassed my bosses. You would've missed the entire mission of your report via be the school district. That's not the intent of anybody."

MAYOR PADILLA: " I think the great thing is and I know great is probably the wrong word but the result again is, in a few weeks we're going to have this discussion and now there's not going to be any argument about who knew what, when and how and who had enough time to respond. So now the only thing we're going to be able talk about are the merits of the issues. And so okay we bite our tongue and swallow our pride a little bit, we say okay. We take that piece of that discussion off the table and we wait a few more weeks, we do what we have to do from a good intergovernmental relations stand point, we give people the benefit of the doubt even if its painful. But when we have the discussion, the discussion is about the issue that you guys want to have, that we want to have."

CITY MANAGER: "I'm going to paraphrase Gary's words, he said in so many words, "these guys have now gave themselves the issue, let's not make it more of an issue in the future", I think Gary, your totally correct."

COMMISSIONER NORDSTROM: "I'll just say one thing because we are all rational beings; with this whole event actually turned out to be the benefit for the GMOC because what occurred that evening had this thing had gone through city council voted threshold not met, there would have been a ripple and gone on. As it stands out now, we've got all the powers to be, if you will, in this room talking about this single issue that has had no resolution for a very long time. Personally I think that there's going to be a great benefit that comes from this because in the future, all of us as commissioners, and future commissioners now will have the much higher expectation level. Probably will be more a little bit more distinct when it comes to that expectation level as well as how far, how far we're willing to push a point. I'm quite satisfied that we've accomplished what we set out to do and that was to bring the spotlight to bear to where it needed to be put."

COMMISSIONER O'NEILL: "A couple of observations, there's a group of us, all of us unpaid and all of us went through this process and it was a unanimous decision on what we did. It wasn't a unanimous decision on the result and I think what rankles is that we had the carpet pulled out from under us at 6:45 on a meeting that was to have started at 6:00. I'll cover a little ground again because in your homily, your soliloquy, after Bill was apologizing one too many times, finding those new standards were not that there was a fairness issue with Sweetwater and that they were not dialogued or consulted. That is factually incorrect. They knew where we were going, we had asked Bruce, we asked them to come to us, all we could do is ask, you've heard my position on that. The threshold is Bruce do you meet it, he says yes because they always say yes they never tempered that yes and it is. And when you have that type of a threshold and your dealing with the elementary district, which has embraced collaboration,

it works. When you have it with another entity that has a business plan of a mushroom farmer, then it doesn't work and it is the inmate minding the asylum.

So they knew, they were invited to us, if they claimed ambush we have them ambushed in that we sent an email to the Superintendent telling him to name the time, name the place, all but we will come to you in the next two weeks; we want to meet with you, we want to talk with you. He ducked it. He puts out his letter, that letter came out we had our April 6th or 8th meeting where in Bruce and Katy were bitterly opposed to our changing the rules. I then had a rejoinder to that letter or his editorial on the following Thursday, and by that Monday he wanted to have lunch with me and I urged him and he followed my urgings to come meet with this group. So but I could of kept my silence and we could of ambushed him because he wouldn't show up. Its factually inaccurate to say that they didn't know what was coming down the pipe and that they weren't dialogued with because they certainly were to the extent that they would present themselves to have a dialogue. Dialogue leaves open exchange between two sides. You can't have a dialogue by in large with that group unfortunately. It is the way of it. I think speaks volumes that you didn't have a mutant that night because that would have been truly embarrassing, it would have had great theater but it probably wouldn't have accomplished as much as we have right now. But we're an independent group, we should of probably have been brought in, all of us, and seeing which way we wanted to go with that. I guess the thing that is the most disappointing, is that there was a high road to take on this and both the city and the district could of come out the heroes on this and that would have been to let us make our report.

If you read that recommendation nobody but a paranoid could take offense to that because it was a conciliatory narrative. It was simply a non-compliant, nobody, in fact you have not said, you have not said that there was nothing factual or that there was anything unfactual about what we said. But had you listened to us, had you then said you had your chance to come out and say yeah we're kind of changing the rules a little bit and here it is and then had Bruce and Katy not both that the minute that they were assured that if it wasn't going to come up. They could of then stood up and say geez guys we're presenting our new plan to our board next week and then we're coming back to you and we all go off into the sunset, hand in hand. That was the high road, that was the way that would have been really productive and it was the way that nobody took. And its unfortunate because everyone could of benefited from that. This result is probably, I mean it is also good, but it's the round about way and you've got many of us with a beak on because we expected to be backed up in this. And because we didn't cross the line on this, I don't think we did at all. You can go back and read a lot of these early documents and what was either recommended to or the verbiage in it; we're not very far off the reservation."

CITY MANAGER: "The written work of your document in all cases except for one little area, no debate, no dispute, totally current. It was that phraseology of non-

compliance when you said in the narrative, “they are in compliance based upon existing standards” that’s in the report.”

COMMISSIONER O’NEILL: “Which essentially is non-standard.”

CITY MANAGER: “Well say it, its in the report, you say that in the report, in the narrative part of the report. But your conclusion in there, and yes it’s a very small sentence, but we find them we don’t know why, we find them to be “not in compliance” that was the -- “

COMMISSIONER O’NEILL: “But if Bruce and Katy came to you guys that evening, at 5:45 or whatever it was that they started lobbying on this, then it was the GMOC that got bushwhacked on this because they had two months to have open dialogue with you folks.”

CITY MANAGER: “I went to staff, my guys in his office, asking what the heck is going on? I read the report over the weekend very thoroughly and I came to the same conclusion as Bruce Husson came to, what is going on? They say “x” all of a sudden there’s no transparency at all from the written narrative to their conclusion. You can ask Daniel, you can ask George that’s your job but it did not compute to me personally. Then I saw Bruce and I saw this written document that was embarrassing in my opinion to the entire GMOC staff and commission members and to the Mayor and five council members. That’s a lose, lose, lose situation in my opinion.”

MAYOR PADILLA: “And Kevin I certainly understand and respect the frustrations and I hear you as to where you’re coming from, you know, from how it went down. I certainly respect and understand that. But I think again the bottom line here is that more attention is being paid to it now, the discussion is going to happen, they’re not going to be able to assert that they weren’t aware, or whether they were or were not. As a matter of fact I would recommend when you come back with recommendations on future threshold standards, future measurements, different ways to interpret or apply what accommodation means, whatever you want to recommend. That you also note in your report all the documentation that you just orally presented, verbally presented about dates, times, when and where, who was talked to, who was invited to show up and who didn’t show up, when and where up to including the minute when the next meeting is to take place. It should be part of your report, so that if somebody comes forward again and says we haven’t had an opportunity, we haven’t had a chance, there’s some other issue raised, then you can say well here’s peoples “A”, with 25 phone calls, 6 different meetings, 5 different invitations that weren’t responded to. And then it’s a lot easier for someone like me or the council to go --“

COMMISSIONER O’NEILL: “Even had we done that though it would of not changed the outcome the other night.”

MAYOR PADILLA: "It might have. But what I'm trying to say Kevin, I think, diplomatically is that I don't think the issue anymore is what happened the other night. The issue is they squawked, we gave them the benefit of the doubt, I made a decision, the council made a decision, your chairman made a decision, which I think was clearly within our prerogative to make and we made it, and it's behind us. And now it hasn't changed a darn thing in terms of the discussion that needs to take place and the discussion that will take place. Only now they have one less argument to make if that's what they plan to assert."

COMMISSIONER O'NEILL: "I agree with you and I won't speak for the others but the fact that we're all here with this is an extraordinary meeting, and in my ten year on GMOC I had never known us to have a meeting immediately after presentation. We're all here and I don't know that anybody has resigned and we certainly didn't walk out. I mean there are a lot of ways we could have gone with this if we didn't truly care about the community and this peripheral crap about there are disgruntled employees or that our report is suspect because it is political in nature because of the intent of some folks simply isn't correct. And I said, one of the emails, I'll take that outside, we'll stand toe to toe with anybody who wants to make that assertion and let the tapes tell the tale because it is wrong."

COMMISSIONER KROGH: "I agree with what you say -- you were very diplomatic that night. I agree with what Dave and Gary was pointing out that we now have proceeded in creating a lot of attention to this. But looking back to what Kevin and Mike are saying I may not express it in passionate terms as Mike, but if you look at it institutionally by the late hour in which you brought it up. I agree with you now Dave but in hindsight it would have been good if you would have come to a meeting. I'm not sure when you got the draft but I regret you didn't read it earlier than you did. But the point was, doing it at the last hour you gave every appearance of overruling our independence of making our report and I would say that in the year that we are planning to do a Growth Management Program, top to bottom review and potentially you write everything, in conjunction with the General Plan Update we have the cloud over us, not only for the school issue in this year's report but how independent we are and whether we are stuck with the pressure and frankly what happened was embarrassing enough. I'd rather be embarrassed by you guys excepting our report and rejecting the one objectionable part and then expressing as the council, the mayor and city manager that -- that you don't except that part that you want to make sure they have a chance to respond. I think that they did have their chances and I agree we should get stuff on the record more and I got some notes tonight about how our own minutes are inadequate on documenting these discussions that went on this year. Maybe if we had an opportunity to talk to you all a day, a week, a month before or maybe we could have all had a different meeting. I was dismayed how the diplomatic consideration was the independence constructiveness."

COMMISSIONER TRIPP: "Dave Rowland does not own this, Mayor Padilla does not own this, we own it. We were all at the same meeting where our Planning

Director and Dan, our right hand man on the staff level. You guys can be as independent as you want, I'm paraphrasing, but you guys can make your call but the City Manager can have a different take on it and the Mayor and council can have a different take on it; its in the minutes too. Now as independent as you want to be, we didn't lay the proper foundation. So it's on us, it's not on Dave, it's not on the Mayor."

COMMISSIONER KROGH: "Remember, I was the one person who was against it."

COMMISSIONER TRIPP: "It doesn't matter. It's just that we didn't lay the foundation, it didn't have the appearance of a level playing field historically and we need to be, in my recommendation, more strategic on how we work together. I think its prudent that we, this is my two cents and my recommendation, that we wait for the schools master plan under the new chair and we move forward after we've carefully consider what comes out. We don't miss and they tried to warn; Jim and his staff. It wasn't so subtle. They gave us a heads up and we said down the torpedoes here we go."

MAYOR PADILLA: "I think believe that I'm interrupting Mr. Chairman, if I could take your lead, I have a group of the Citizens Advisory Committee members on the bayfront are at a thank you dinner that started an hour ago and are waiting. So I got to go over there and give them my appreciation for their work on the bayfront. But I wanted to come just to have a chance to have some dialogue with you and reemphasize why some of the decisions were made and again I hope the focus again is on where we go from here and on getting, let's have, seeing when this next, when this final piece comes forward. And talk about with the council and with all of you and hopefully in a constructive way with the SUHSD, although frankly I'm not real optimistic that will happen but I would certainly would like that to be the case."

COMMISSIONER NORDSTROM: "One request Mr. Mayor before you leave, I would request as an individual member of this commission that the current consultant who's building this top to bottom review, that we be involved in that process. Here before we have had not any conversation with this guy, we've never met him. We really feel that we deserve that opportunity."

COMMISSIONER TRIPP: "Mayor Padilla, we know you have to scoot, we thank you very much."

COMMISSIONER PALMA: "If I could ask the Mayor and City Manager one question on a different subject before leaving. Because of the changes that are happening, when the Ken Lee building is demolished to make room for the new fire station, how if you would please, keep the Ken Lee memory alive with either another building or changing Eastlake to Ken Lee Estates or something like that but to keep his name going. Will you please put that in the back of your head."

COMMISSIONER TRIPP: "Motion to adjourn for three minutes for a break."
(End of verbatim transcript)

(Recess)

(In session)

At this time, Chairperson Tripp opened up discussion amongst the GMOC commission members.

Motion to record names of public attendance at meetings and to reflect those names in the minutes.

Vote: unanimous.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MSC(Nordstrom/Palma) to accept the minutes as written.

Vote: 6-2-0-1

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

At this time, Chair Tripp permitted persons from the public to comment.

Recognized, Kimberly Longo and Mya Bloch from the public. Both shared their appreciation and comments made by the GMOC commissioners on concerns with the Sweetwater Union High School District.

A suggestion by Kimberly Longo was made in reference to the next round of questionnaires for the SUHSD; was to involve feedback from the teachers and staff.

5. DISCUSSION AND/OR ELECTION OF CHAIR

MSC (Palma/O'Neill) nominated Gary Nordstrom for position of GMOC Chair and David Krogh for position of GMOC Vice Chair.

Vote: unanimous

6. OTHER ISSUES

Dan announced that a meeting with the Growth Management Consultant would be held on Tuesday, July 20th at 6:00p.m. in the Public Services Building, conference rooms 2 & 3. Each commissioner is encouraged to attend to be brought up to date of the Top to Bottom review of the growth standards and to have comments be heard by the GMOC commissioners.

Jim Sandoval, Director of Planning and Building, praised Commissioner Tripp on his support and direction as the chairperson for the GMOC during this review period.

Commissioner Nordstrom inquired about the direction of the GMOC members on its response on the issues/concerns with SUHSD.

Dan stated that a report by the SUHSD would be distributed to the members when Dan receives it. A meeting will be scheduled to meet with the SUHSD to review that document. A next separate meeting will be scheduled to deliberate on the GMOC's previous recommendation.

Dan indicated that this would be Cheryl Cisneros' final GMOC meeting as the regular support staff person and thanked her for her years of service to the GMOC.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Tripp adjourned tonight's meeting at 8:10p.m.

Cheryl Cisneros
Management Assistant

Daniel Forster
Growth Management Coordinator